

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: June 25 Packet Supplement No. 2 - Redtail Ridge GDP/Comp Plan Amendments
Attachments: Combined Comments 6.25.2020.pdf

From: Rob Zuccaro
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 8:38 AM
To: 'stevebrauneis@hotmail.com' <stevebrauneis@hotmail.com>; 'Jeff Moline' <jeffandkristin_colorado@yahoo.com>; 'Thomas Rice' <trice@sgrllc.com>; 'Dietrich Hoefner' <dietrich.hoefner@gmail.com>; Ben Diehl <ben.diehl@gmail.com>; '(null) (null)' <keatonhowe@yahoo.com>; 'Debra Williams' <dawmjw@gmail.com>
Cc: Lisa Ritchie <lritchie@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: June 25 Packet Supplement No. 2 - Redtail Ridge GDP/Comp Plan Amendments

Chair Brauneis and Members of the Commission:

Please find attached public comments on the Redtail Ridge GDP and Comp Plan amendment requests that staff received through the end of the day yesterday.

Thank You,

Rob Zuccaro

Rob Zuccaro, AICP
Planning and Building Safety Director
City of Louisville
303-335-4590

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Please do not rezone

-----Original Message-----

From: Julie Abrams [mailto:justjabrams@gmail.com]

Sent: Saturday, June 20, 2020 7:12 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Please do not rezone

I am writing as a concerned citizen to ask you to please not rezone the old Storage Tek sight. The citizens of Louisville do not want this and the only people who do have a financial interest in the property.

Thank you for your consideration,

Julie Abrams
917 Eldorado Lane
Louisville, CO

Sent from my iPhone

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Red Tail Ridge

From: beth armbruster [<mailto:brusterbeth@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 10:26 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Red Tail Ridge

To the planning Commision,

I would like to know if the developer of this project is following green building standards? I would like the builder to make this a livable and sustainable community with the residential areas furthest from the highway. I am asking the planning commission to be sensitive to light pollution and to protect the night sky, allow wildlife corridors to exist, xeriscape with community gardens, parks, community gathering space, exercise areas in the senior housing areas, stores within walkable distance, etc. Who is going to ensure this community is built so it is not an isolated bedroom community with few amenities that requires a large mass of people to drive to meet basic needs such as what has been built across the street? This community can be a model of mix use and diversity which includes wildlife.

I am asking the board to be environmentally aware and remember the future is now.

Beth Armbruster

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: STOP REDTAIL

-----Original Message-----

From: Nancy Keer Armstrong [mailto:nancy.keer.armstrong@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 1:12 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: STOP REDTAIL

Hello:

PLEASE STOP this development from moving forward as it has been proposed.

WE DO NOT HAVE THE CAPACITY OR INFRASTRUCTURE IN PLACE TO SUPPORT THIS LAND GRAB!!!

And FIVE STORIES???

WHY IS TJIS DEVELOPMENT GETTING A PASS WITH regard to HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS!!!

I SMELL A RAT...

N

Sent from my iPhone

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Development project

From: Irfan Azeem [<mailto:smirfanazeem@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 3:20 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge Development project

Dear Louisville Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to you about the enormous development planned for the old Storage Tek site at the end of town. The proposed development is considerably larger than the development approved for Conoco Phillips, which was itself larger than anything Storage Tek ever built there. For many years the site has not had any buildings on it at all. In addition to destroying the wildlife that has occupied it since Storage Tek left, and before it came, the Redtail Ridge project would negatively impact the rest of the city by adding more vehicles and traffic and straining the city's budget. In their videos, the developers claim that they are part of the Louisville community, but the size and destructiveness of the Redtail project prove otherwise. I believe it is significant that Boulder County also opposes this development.

Please vote no on the Redtail Ridge and Medtronic development applications.

Thank you.

Irfan Azeem
Louisville, CO

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Huge Development

From: Charlene Bandurian [<mailto:clbandurian@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 7:06 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Huge Development

To: Planning Comission

I am not in favor of the huge development that may occur at the old Storage Tech property. Our town will be ruined if the development occurs. The traffic will be horrendous, and there will be too many people for our town to accommodate. I am a resident of Louisville for 36 years.

Charlene Bandurian
139 Lincoln Circle
Louisville

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

June 24, 2020

RE: Support for Redtail Ridge Comprehensive Plan Amendment and General Development Plan Amendment

Dear Members of the Louisville Planning Commission;

I am writing in support of your approval of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and General Development Plan for the proposed Redtail Ridge development. There is no question in my mind of the importance of the redevelopment of the largest remaining land parcel in Louisville in a way that will benefit a sustainable economy and return benefits to our residents, now and for future generations. I applaud the foresight of the Commission to plan two opportunities for discussion of the Comp Plan Amendments requested for Redtail Ridge.

I listened to the June 11 public comment regarding RedTail Ridge. Although I was impressed with the thoughtfulness of most of the comments in opposition to or critical of the proposal, I was not swayed from my support. A point I would like to reinforce is the path to diversity adding housing at this site can facilitate. Following is the previous letter I sent you.

What follows is substantially the same as the letter I sent prior to the June 11 meeting.

My insights as a professional transportation planner will inform my comments to you as well as my understanding of the project and how it has evolved from the original proposal. I have participated in Brue Baukol's public involvement events, including the walking site tour this winter. Which had some déjà vu for me as I recalled being on the site when StorageTek was an active employer.

Key issues I will offer comment on are as follows:

1. Land Use Proposal for parcels and their relationship to the site and existing fabric of the community.
2. Transportation and Mobility
3. Dark Sky requirements and Electric Vehicle Charging Stations

1. Land Use Proposal and Integration of Site

Brue Baukol's team has developed an intimate understanding of the site and listened to community input. Parcel F provides an excellent buffer at the edge of the site and will reserve a continuous corridor of natural habitat. The active park land at the northwest corner will provide the community with much needed resources. The addition of a dog park will relieve some of the burden of the existing facilities and provide options for

people living in the southern part of the city rather than traveling to enjoy the outdoors with their furry friends. I was very pleased to see the support of the Open Space Advisory Board, Parks & Landscaping Board and Recreation Board for the proposal. The dedication of additional public land could improve support for the natural habits which will be disrupted by the development.

Locating the Senior Living on Parcel A is a respectful and quiet location to provide an option for our aging population to live in Louisville. Locating office buildings along the US 36 edge provides a buffer to the residential uses, continues the commercial uses along the corridor, and provides good visibility to attract tenants.

The proposed layout for the Medtronic Campus is described in greater detail in Agenda item 6. D. It gave me additional confidence that these buildings will be located in the portion of the site where their height may have the least impact on the view shed the community values. I do not find the height variance to be unreasonable and the proposed design provides a “Zen view” of the mountains at the entry. I would encourage the Commission to continue to work with applicant to refine the architectural design to create a more signature building that will become an icon for Louisville.

2. Transportation and Mobility

The magnitude of transportation and mobility improvements necessary to support the site is staggering. The new infrastructure is equivalent to building a small stand-alone city.

The multimodal internal roadway system of complete streets will do much to facilitate safe travel for all users. It has the potential to be an aesthetic amenity for the development as well. Connectivity to the existing roadway network will ensure access. The trail and bikeway system will encourage different kinds of users, and separating cyclists and pedestrians is a gift. The provision of a trail corridor from the site to Downtown Louisville is hugely important, especially with the proposed widening of 96th Street and increased traffic.

My greatest concern for the impact of the proposed GDP amendment is the addition of vehicles on US 36 and at the interchange of the Northwest Parkway. We can't build our way out of that, and it's unlikely that CDOT or Broomfield will have the resources to invest. Even if the resources were available, the magnitude of the needs of the intersection and roadway would change the character and functionality of a key entrance to Louisville.

Moving more people in less vehicles is a critical strategy to maximize existing and even the proposed new roadway capacity. In government, we often pay more attention to the capital improvements, and maintenance costs. Local government has not recently

taken a strong role in operating transit. This is a time for partnerships with RTD and the private sector to provide a viable option to the single occupant vehicle.

3. Dark Sky requirements and Electric Vehicle Charging Stations

As the details of the development proceed, I hope the city would require dark sky infrastructure. This could be one of the greatest gifts provided to the community,

There is significant discussion in the amendment of required car parking, but I saw no mention of provision of electric vehicle parking. This must be integral in all of the development.

Thank you for your service as the Planning Commission, and for consideration of my input. I hope to see the GDP Amendment for Redtail Ridge move forward.

Sincerely,

Debra A. Baskett
730 W. Willow Street

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Concerns about StorageTek development

-----Original Message-----

From: Chandi Beck [mailto:chandibeck@hotmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 1:32 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Concerns about StorageTek development

Water usage is a major concern. Water is already at a prime cost and availability is diminishing rapidly for already in place businesses and residences.

I would propose that all of the towns pool money together to buy the property as open space, public space. I am absolutely opposed to this development.

Thanks,

Chandi Beck
Superior, CO

Sent from my iPhone

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge development

From: Steve Belin [<mailto:steve@belin.org>]

Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 1:46 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge development

Dear Planning Commission:

Regarding the Redtail Ridge development, I believe the commission should vote no on the development plan and the PUD.

The developer's proposal is too big. They should come back with a plan the size of what was approved for ConocoPhillips, which is already a generous 60% bigger than Storage Tek.

I also believe the commission should vote that the developer does not meet the criteria for a comprehensive plan change. The developer must meet every one of the four criteria for the Planning Commission to be able to vote yes.

Further, Louisville does not need 900 more multi-family rental units.

Thank you,

Steve Belin
941 Jefferson Ave.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: proposal for Redtail Ridge

From: Carla Bigum [<mailto:bigumc@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 7:57 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: RE: proposal for Redtail Ridge

To City Council Members,

I am VERY concerned about the large-scale development for the proposed Redtail Ridge proposal. I am NOT opposed to development for any city, including our city of Louisville. I am a long-time resident since 1989. I have watched and participated in some of the city developments over the years. This development in particular has me concerned for several reasons.

1. Increased traffic.
2. Height of office buildings

- The beauty of the property was not hidden when Storage Tek was a business and had operations.
- The property is like a “gateway” vista for the area, not just the city. Let it not be grown over with buildings/lights/parking, etc.

3. Listen to the citizens over the requests/demands/sales pitch of the developers.
4. Find a happy medium between original plan and what the citizens desire to see the area grow into.
5. The proposal in its final form should enhance the livability of the City of Louisville.

- What will the developer offer to the city? Stay firm with what the city wants. This is not a completed deal. It does not even have to be accepted. We, the city, should be the negotiator for what the developer would like to offer. While it would mean increased sales tax, what else can the developer offer? I’d say make the developer work hard for a position with the City of Louisville. We have a city which has continually been a top place to live. Let us continue to strive for that goal.

6. What do the Boulder County Commissioners think of the proposal?
7. How will Superior residents be impacted?
8. What about Broomfield County and its burgeoning growth across the street?

Carla Bigum
273 S Lincoln Ave.
Louisville, CO.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Opposed to Development at RedTail Ridge

From: Joe Booch [<mailto:jbucciaglia@gmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 2:38 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Opposed to Development at RedTail Ridge

Hello Louisville,

I have been an property owner in Louisville for 17 years and a resident for 11. This development is NOT in keeping with the tradition of this town, especially now that the town has already grown so extremely quickly. This land is best suited as open space – as a border between Louisville and other towns, as an act of environmental stewardship for the last remaining tracks available for foxes, prairie dogs, coyotes, rabbits and birds and as a place for people to gather and breath!

STOP this proposal – please remember you work for and represent the people and the spirit of this town! Not the developers asking for 5 (FIVE!) stories!

Thank you,

Joe

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Urgent message re: Development

From: Tiffany Boyd [<mailto:tiffboyd@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 7:50 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Urgent message re: Development

Dear Louisville Planning Commission,

Thank you for representing Louisville in looking at appropriate development plans for our great town.

I'd like to express my concern about the plan for the former Storage Tek site and the Planned Unit Development.

Please vote "No" on the development plan and PUD on the agenda. The developer should have offered/should still offer a much smaller plan - a plan the size of what was approved for ConocoPhillips. The developer does not meet the criteria for a comprehensive plan change - "Our Livable Small Town Feel" will not remain intact with this current plan. The developer can already build up to 3 million square feet under the current "rural" designation. That is enough!

Please vote to uphold the original plan and work within these parameters.

Thank you for all the work you are doing!

Sincerely,

Tiffany Boyd, Volunteer
Louisville Sustainability

Advisory Board

--

With Kindness,

*Tiffany Boyd (she,her)
Classrooms for Climate Action*

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Development

From: Bill Buffum [<mailto:wbuffum44@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 6:46 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Development

Hello,

My name is Bill Buffum. I live at 589 Ridge View Dr. in Louisville and have lived there for 9 years now. This is near to the Storage Tech property at question.

In regards to the Redtail Ridge Development plan, I would like to give support to the concept. After reading the proposal, I find that it is fairly conceived and is sure to provide important benefits to Louisville. Yes, there may be needed tweaks like the traffic plan, but overall, it looks great. I might suggest a new entrance off of Dillon for Monarch schools. The school needs better access anyway.

I think that we can expect to see new well-paying jobs created, needed housing (seniors), and office space for the future. Change is difficult for us all, but now is a great time to move forward into the future. The positives far outnumber the concerns.

Yours,
Bill Buffum



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Rob Zuccaro

Subject:

FW: Redtail Proposal

From: Larry Cappel [<mailto:larrycappel@gmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 6:52 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Proposal

I want to speak up about this proposed development. It is too big. Louisville and the surrounding area does not need this.

It has too large of an environmental impact.

It will cause too much traffic on roads that already have too much traffic.

It will cause more air pollution.

It will destroy habitat that wildlife uses and deserves to have.

We do not need more development, especially of the commercial type. We also do not need more people moving to an area unless there is traffic mitigation that reduces traffic below current flows. This means robust people moving systems that do not include autos on roads.

These people moving systems need to be paid for by the developer as part of building anything on this land that I as a resident of the city am part owner of

Additionally protection of wildlife needs to have as high of a importance as any other criteria. The developer also needs to pay all costs associated with assuring all wildlife is well cared for and none are lost to development

Please do not sell your souls to these developers for some paltry tax dollars. I know city government is set up to serve developers. It is time city government starts serving people, the residents, instead of these destructive business interests.

Sincerely,

Larry Cappel

303-523-6123

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: REDTAIL RIDGE PROPOSAL

From: David Chaladoff [<mailto:dchaladoff@me.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 4:11 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: REDTAIL RIDGE PROPOSAL

We are against the building and REDTAIL RIDGE PROPOSAL. We hope the planning commission uses common sense and pragmatism and votes no to it too.

David & Cathy Chaladoff
388 Fairfield Lane
Louisville, CO 80027

phone: 831-521-6705

David Chaladoff
dchaladoff@me.com
cell: 831-521-6705

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Stop Redtail Ridge

-----Original Message-----

From: Matthew Cox [mailto:2matthewcox@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 1:25 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Stop Redtail Ridge

Dear Planning Commission,

I am writing in regards to the Redtail Ridge Development. My wife and I strongly oppose this development. This proposal is far too large for the area and would have a tremendous negative impact on this community which we love. Living in Louisville for the past seven years we have watched as developers continue to change our town for the worse by placing homes in such high densities as to strain our fire department, police departments, and city infrastructure to name a few. These developers continue to play the game of 'bait and switch' with Louisville and other communities. The developments always seem to change to the better for the developers and to the detriment of the communities. How many years has it been since the developments at Steel Ranch and North End started? All these years later and no commercial space has been developed. They had no problems packing housing in and then have left us with the piles of dirt where the commercial developments were agreed to be placed (presumably they are simply waiting until the city allows them to build more houses where those commercial spaces were to be).

The city of Louisville cannot handle an increase of this size in housing, and the residents of Louisville and the surrounding communities have been begging for years to stop these massive developments. Those of us who live in Louisville cherish our open space, the small town feel, the amazing sense of community, and our sustainability for our economy, community, and our environment. This development is not welcome in any shape or form within our community. Building something of this size and stature would be disrespectful to all Louisville, Broomfield, and Boulder County residents. I can only imagine what this would do to our already strained commutes on Northwest Parkway and the 36 corridor, and our increasingly crowded trail systems. I hope you understand where our community stands, and your support in the matter would be greatly appreciated. Let's keep Louisville an amazing place to live and tell these developers that their plan is too dense and large in scale and that it cannot be approved as presented.

Regards,

Matt & Rachel Cox
2010 Centennial Drive
Louisville, CO

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Opposition to the Redtail Ridge Development

From: rachel cox [<mailto:rachelandrianna@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 12:22 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Opposition to the Redtail Ridge Development

Dear Planning Commission,

I am writing in regards to the Redtail Ridge Development. Both my husband and I strongly oppose this development. This proposal is far too large for the area, and would completely change the landscape negatively forever more. We cannot handle an increase in housing, and development of this size. Those of us who live in Louisville cherish our open space, the small town feel, the amazing sense of community, and our sustainability for our economy, community, and our environment.

This development is not welcome in any shape or form within our community. Building something of this size and stature would be disrespectful to all Louisville, Broomfield, and Boulder County residents. I can only imagine what this would do to our already strained commutes on the 36 corridor, and our already overcrowded trail systems. I hope you understand where our community stands, and your support in the matter would be greatly appreciated.

Rachel & Matt Cox

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Comprehensive Plan

From: Lawrence Crowley [<mailto:magic@ecentral.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 1:32 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge Comprehensive Plan

Brue Baukol Capital Partners is applying for a General Development Plan (GDP) and Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Redtail Ridge. This would more than double the amount of development currently allowed in the current GDP and Comprehensive Plan, potentially add 3,000 people to the area, and would generate 49 to 89 percent more vehicle trips than previous occupant Storage Tek.

I do not believe this is a wise or prudent use for this land. Lining the pocket of developers while indemnifying our children and grandchildren to pay for this makes no sense from our Town's perspective. It will be an albatross forever if it is built. We will live with the consequences. Please reject this blatant disregard of our Town's needs.

Thank you,

Lawrence Crowley
441 Pheasant Run
Louisville 80027

303-666-0640

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: 900 new living units

From: Paul Darby [<mailto:paulmichaeldarby@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 8:05 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: 900 new living units

Hello!

Louisville does not need 900 new living units. Density of traffic, crowding, parking and quality of life issues will be impacted.

Please do not approve this plan as projected.

Paul Darby
144 South Madison Avenue, Louisville Colorado 80027

With all of the increased internet activity because of the worldwide crisis we are undergoing, I have noticed that on occasion someone says they have received an email that I did not send or did not receive a message that I did send. If you notice anything that seems off, please email me a message alerting me to the situation and hopefully I will get it in my inbox.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: No on Red Tail Development

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Dayan [mailto:marksdayan@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 5:35 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: No on Red Tail Development

1. Need environmental impact
2. Need re-assessment post-covid
3. Too large and dense for Louisville

How will Retail and office generate taxes post Covid Thanks Mark Dayan
946 Saint Andrews Ln
303-522-0394

Sent from my iPhone

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Old Storage Tek site development

-----Original Message-----

From: justin deister [mailto:justin@uppercasedesign.us]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 7:57 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Old Storage Tek site development

Just repeating my concern and opposition to the huge proposed development on the old Storage Tek site.

I think Louisville can come up with a development that is more in line with our vision of ourselves as a small town.

I would be happy to present a plan for smaller scale development.

Thanks,

Justin Deister -resident of 30 years.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge traffic

From: tomdelorey@aol.com [<mailto:tomdelorey@aol.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 4:12 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: tomdelorey@aol.com; nikymb@gmail.com
Subject: Redtail Ridge traffic

Dear Sirs & Madams:

I have still not heard a credible solution to the problem that WILL be caused by the rush hour traffic entering and leaving the Redtail Ridge property. Without a traffic solution, the development should be cut back to just the Senior housing area (since they do not tend to come and go at rush hour; you could expend it for all I care) and the one major manufacturing tenant. We don't need 900 rental housing units with tenants that will come and go at rush hour, we don't need retail other than perhaps a gas station mini-mart and a fast food restaurant or two, and we don't need more hotels.

Tom DeLorey
587 Augusta Lane
Louisville, CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Massive Dev. Proposal

-----Original Message-----

From: Myriam Charry Doerr [mailto:rmdoerr@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 3:57 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Massive Dev. Proposal

My husband and I are oppose to this project. That's a rural area, plus we do not need more housing which comes with all the negative effects as crime.

Myriam Charry Doerr
Richard P Doerr

Sent from my iPhone

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: from Audrey Fallik

From: Howard Fallik [<mailto:iamhef@msn.com>]

Sent: Sunday, June 21, 2020 8:31 PM

To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: from Audrey Fallik

To whom this may concern,

As a 32 year resident of Louisville, I am concerned about the proposal for the Redtail Ridge community, near Monarch H.S. My husband and I have lived in Louisville since 1987. We moved here for a variety of reasons, including the comfort of a hometown feel.

While there may be positive aspects to a large construction project, our concern is the potential for negative consequences to the Louisville community.

To what extent will traffic increase?

Will Louisville retain this "hometown feel" that is so valued?

Would Louisville undergo a transition from a friendly and familiar small city to one that is less welcoming and not as comfortable?

Would such a large project put a strain on city resources, and result in a city that its citizens may find is not as enjoyable, and not as safe?

Since first moving to Louisville the city has grown a great deal. For the most part this growth has been well managed, and has not been of real concern.

Redtail Ridge may change that perception for myself and for other residents.

Perhaps it's most advisable to err on the side of retaining the kind of city with which we are so familiar, and much prefer.

Thank you,

Audrey Fallik

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: No on Redtail Ridge!

From: Janine Fitzgerald [<mailto:j9fitz@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 5:31 PM

To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: No on Redtail Ridge!

Dear Planning Commission-

Please do not approve the Redtail Ridge development as designed. Yes, I would like to see something at the old Storage Tek facility, but this project is too big for our town. Do you live in Louisville? Have your children gone to Monarch PK-8 or Monarch High School? This project will add soooooo much more traffic to our town. There's already too much traffic. I've lived here for 16 years and it has changed, but not necessarily for the better.

Please, please vote NO.

Janine Fitzgerald

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Development - Do Not Support

From: Marike Fitzgerald [<mailto:marike.fitzgerald@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 9:11 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Development - Do Not Support

Hello,

I am a resident of Louisville at 992 Arapahoe Cir, Louisville, CO 80027.

I do not support the current Redtail Ridge plans for development of the Phillips 66 property. The scope is way too large and will hugely impact traffic and the small town way of life that the current Louisville residents know and love.

The developer does not seem to care about sustainability or preservation of wildlife habitats. There are much better uses for this property than what is proposed. Please don't cave to corporate pressure and look out for those of us who already call Louisville our beloved home.

Thank you for your time,

Marike Fitzgerald
992 Arapahoe Cir,
Louisville, CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: NO to change in zoning for RedTail Ridge development proposal

From: Natasha Flyer [<mailto:natasha.flyer@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 7:50 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: NO to change in zoning for RedTail Ridge development proposal

Dear Louisville Planning Commission,

The RedTail Ridge development proposal is far too large, will cause noise, air, and light pollution in our neighborhood, and will greatly harm wildlife. Please do not approve this change of zoning.

Signed:

Natasha Flyer
1640 Egret Way
Superior CO 80027

Susan Bauer
1770 Morrison Court
Superior CO 80027

Mary Ginnane
1831 Mallard Dr.
Superior CO 80027

Kathy Carty Mullen
1250 S. Boyero Ct.
Superior CO 80027

Shawn Scott
2112 Concord Lane
Superior CO 80027

Satin Scott
2112 Concord Lane
Superior CO 80027

Sasha Stiles
1335 S Mesa Ct Superior, CO 80027
Superior CO 80027

Christopher Houghton
1335 S Mesa Ct
Superior CO 80027

Kelly Macaulay
1950 Shamrock Dr.
Superior CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Red Tail Ridge

From: Michael Fried [<mailto:m40402@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 9:22 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Red Tail Ridge

I am a Louisville resident and I am opposed to the plan put forth so far. My reasons are:

The proposal is way, way too big. The developer should come back with a plan the size of what was approved for ConocoPhillips, which is already a generous 60% bigger than Storage Tek, and to vote no on the development plan and PUD on the agenda.

The developer does not meet the criteria for a comprehensive plan change. The developer **must meet every one of the four criteria (listed below) for the Planning Commission to be able to vote yes.** (From my read, they can't meet any of the criteria.) The developer can already build up to three million square feet under the current "Rural" designation, so a comprehensive plan change is not needed. That's twice the size of StorageTek and much bigger than Conoco Phillips 2.4 million square feet. Medtronic can easily fit into that space with lots of room left over for office and retail.

Louisville does not need 900 more multi-family rental units which are essentially out of town, will increase rental units to about 45% of Louisville's housing stock and will make the city actually lose tax base.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Fried
1345 Snowberry Ln
Louisville

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Storage tech site

From: alan gallagher [<mailto:alang916w@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 9:29 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Storage tech site

The proposed plan is totally out of proportion; way to big, and too much residential. You already screwed up by attaching a tax break to the land; don't follow that with something very expensive for Louisville, less desirable environmentally, and out of proportion for the site.

Alan Gallagher
916 W. Alder St.
Louisville, CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: VOTE NO on Redtail Ridge

From: Ann GODBY [<mailto:godbya@comcast.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 9:00 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: VOTE NO on Redtail Ridge

Dear Louisville Planning Commission,

Thank you for representing Louisville in researching appropriate development plans for our remarkable town. I'd like to express my sincere concern for the current plan for the former StorageTek site and the Planned Unit Development. Please vote no on the development plan and PUD on the agenda. The developer should have and still may offer a much smaller plan more appropriate of what was approved for ConocoPhillips, which was already much larger than what I saw while riding my bike or driving past StorageTek decades ago. The developer does not meet any of the criteria for a comprehensive plan change, let alone all four. "Our Livable Small Town Feel" will be accosted with this current plan. Interestingly, the developer is using the beautiful, native Colorado bird for its project name, yet the actual impact off the environment is unacceptable. Three million sq. ft. under the current Rural Designation is ENOUGH! Nine hundred more multi family rental units will toll all city resources while actually decreasing our tax base. Now, and never, is not the time to sell our town and its citizens short. The developer is able to comply with the needs and desires of our community by meeting all four criteria, which it has refused to yet accomplish.

Thank you for representing us and for voting consistently to uphold our small-town feel that citizens have voiced in numerous surveys and venues.

Sincerely,
Ann Godby
1200 Grant Avenue
Louisville, CO. 80027

33 year resident and Louisville Elementary School Librarian

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge - Exacerbating an Already Bad Traffic Situation

From: Andy Graziano [<mailto:graz5aj@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 12:00 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge - Exacerbating an Already Bad Traffic Situation

To whom it may concern,

I have lived in Louisville for over three years now. My children go to Peak to Peak in Lafayette and as such we frequently make the drive cross town from Southwest Louisville to Lafayette via Courtesy Dr/95th street. The traffic situation has gotten progressively worse over the last 3 years. In particular the intersection at 95th and South Boulder Rd has become very dangerous and extremely congested, with traffic backing up for 1/4 mile. In particular the traffic is awful in the morning and late afternoons, including turning onto 287 from Empire Rd, getting through the intersection at Baseline/South Boulder Rd and 287. Absolutely forget about taking Dillon Rd to the east.

These primary thoroughfares are not designed for current volume of traffic. With the development of Redtail Ridge and bringing even more residents into the area, these thoroughfares will become gridlock. We have to prevent driving our community to the same place that Boulder has been driven where congestion is the normal and ruins the look and feel of the town. I blame the development east of Northwest parkway having created this situation and building a similar development just to the west will be VERY detrimental to our community.

How do you plan on dealing with the traffic this WILL created on Courtesy Rd, Empire Rd, South Boulder Rd and Dillon as people who live at Redtail Ridge are trying to get to and from work and taking kids to and from school??

--

Andy Graziano
749 Apple Ct, Louisville
(303) 709-0209
graz5aj@gmail.com

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Do not approve StorageTek plan

-----Original Message-----

From: Lucia Harrop [mailto:lucia.harrop@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 8:23 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Do not approve StorageTek plan

Hello-

The storagetek redevelopment plan is too big, will create too many new residences without revenue and infrastructure and is not a good fit for Louisville.

Please deny this developer's plan.

--Lucia

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: I like what you are doing with the old storage teck grounds. Good work

From: Earl Hauserman [<mailto:earlhauserman@icloud.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 8:21 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: I like what you are doing with the old storage teck grounds. Good work

Yes, it might be a little big but not by much. Keep going forward, yes change is difficult for some but they will come around.

Earl Hauserman
350 Fairfield Lane
Louisville, CO
720-890-1212

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: StorageTek site re-development

From: Laurie Helma [<mailto:lkhelma@comcast.net>]

Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 12:20 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: StorageTek site re-development

Planning Commission: I have been a resident of Louisville for more than 40 years. More than anything I have loved the small town feel. The proposal for this development at the former StorageTek site is extreme and will do nothing but hurt our population and change our culture. We do not need the extra traffic from a sudden influx of new residents in such a concentrated area.

Please tell the developer that their proposal is way, way too big. They should come back with a plan the size of what was approved for ConocoPhillips, which is already a generous 60% bigger than Storage Tek.

Please vote NO on the development plan and PUD on the agenda.

Please vote that the developer does not meet the criteria for a comprehensive plan change. The developer **must meet every one of the four criteria for the Planning Commission to be able to vote yes**. I do not see that they meet any of the criteria. The developer can already build up to three million square feet under the current "Rural" designation, so a comprehensive plan change is not needed. That's twice the size of Storage Tek and much bigger than Conoco Phillips' 2.4 million square feet.

Please tell the developer that Louisville does not need 900 more multi-family rental units which are essentially out of town, will increase rental units to about 45% of Louisville's housing stock and will make the city actually lose tax base. It is well known that homeowners take better care of their property than do renters. Is this really what you want on the doorstep of our small town?

I am generally in favor of reasonable and thoughtful development, but in this case it appears to be a plan to line the pockets of developers; expensive PR firm notwithstanding.

Please vote against this current proposal and require that this developer return with something in smaller scale and in the spirit and interest of our wonderful community.

Respectfully,
Laurie K. Helma

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Andy James - Redtail Ridge Hearing

From: ANDY JAMES [<mailto:ydnaj@msn.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 3:59 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Andy James - Redtail Ridge Hearing

Hi Planning Commission,
I support the Redtail Ridge development. I believe this development is long over due.

Andy James
7420 Panorama Dr.
Boulder, Co. 80303

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

-----Original Message-----

From: Ellen Jardine [mailto:ellen@frii.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 10:03 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

This development doubles the development currently allowed in the GDP/current comprehensive plan (how is that even legal?). DOUBLES! Changes the current height restrictions from 2-3 stories to 5. Traffic ratings in that area decrease to F. FAR ratios also double, from .25 to .50!

Louisville does not have the infrastructure to support this increase in population, traffic, utilities and development. It is appalling that the planning commission has not already pushed this back on the developer with a directive to decrease the impact and size/scope of the project. This will fundamentally change the community of Louisville and the county of Boulder in ways that we do NOT support. It is clear that money is doing the talking here and it is reprehensible.

As a member of this community, I strongly opposed this development. Do not sell out the people and spirit that makes this town so desirable and enjoyable to live in. We will become another Westminster, and that is not why I live and pay taxes here.

Ellen Jardine
ellen@frii.com

390 Owl Dr.
Louisville, CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

From: Maryan Jaross [<mailto:mjaross@comcast.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 5:44 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

To the Planning Commissioners:

We attended the entire hearing and presentations about Redtail Ridge.

While there were only 15 public comments at the end, after 10:00 p.m. (?), the issue with these zoom meetings is that you can't see the 40 or 60 people nodding in agreement so we don't bring up the same objections. Zoom does allow for polling if you're interested.

We attended the early Brue Baukol presentation (when they were still calling it Nawatny Ridge) at the Rec Center and were mostly in favor of the plan as presented then. Medtronic has been a good neighbor and is a wonderful company; ericsson Wind Crest communities seem to be very reputable and well-run so no objection to them either.

What we heard Brue Baukol present to the Planning Commission was double the size and scope of what was originally proposed/presented and we do object. We walked the property as much as possible last weekend and were pretty stunned. The original plans didn't call for all this additional residential development, nor a second corporatists tenant.

Concerns are:

- That they seem to want to build a city within our city that does not contribute to the character of Louisville.
- Too many buildings that are too tall.
- Generate too much traffic: we live off of Dillon in Coal Creek Ranch.
- Medtronic parking lots seem excessive and pave over too much land that should be absorbing water, provide parks, green areas. Why not a garage for employees?
- No solar on rooftops specified.
- Retail too far from senior community
- Where is the transportation plan and traffic study? Saying that you're talking to RTD is meaningless. Would there be transportation to downtown? to McCaslin? These businesses need or support.
- Brue Baukol would subcontract to other builders for parts of this development in the future. Would they be bound by decisions you make now?

Suggestion: Build a grocery store initially (King Sooner's?) and capture sales tax revenue from Broomfield residents. They went ahead and built up that whole section of Broomfield hoping to monetize the Conoco Phillips property for themselves. They have now built car dealerships, etc. that will contribute to their tax revenue.

We hope you will not approve this project as presented at your last meeting. We also hope that you will allow for more public comment.

Respectfully,

Maryan Jaross
Tom Lepak

Maryan Jaross

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Vote No on the StorageTek / Conoco development

Importance: High

From: Joel [<mailto:shay25@q.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 4:16 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Vote No on the StorageTek / Conoco development

Importance: High

Dear Louisville,

The current citizens love our small town feel and sense of community.

This development is WAY TOO BIG !!!

We don't need additional housing, nor do we need additional retail or office space, and we do not need any more residents.

I have heard that many of the condominiums in the area are not at full capacity (and by the way, they are a scar on the landscape).

Over the last years I have seen many retail buildings for "Let" and yet they stay empty (because other townships (Lafayette, Broomfield, and Superior) give the retailers better deals to move to their city (**Sam's many years ago and today Kohl's is a prime example**).

Your department is entitled "Planning Commission", but you don't seem to be planning anything, just being manipulated by Big – time Developers who don't have the city's and residents interests at heart.

Please vote NO on this Conoco development, and instead concentrate on determining why businesses are leaving, and put in a plan to keep businesses in Louisville.

I just drove a one-square mile around Home Depot (N, E, S, and W) and found 275 Century Circle for Lease, 339 Century Circle for Lease 375 Century Circle for lease, 168 Centennial Parkway for lease, Kohl's for sale, Sam's Club (left vacant for over 10 years, now a church), 1172 Century Drive – space for lease, 363 Centennial – for lease – office space, 361 Centennial – Office space for lease, a bank out of business. I'm sure this is pretty representative of the whole city. WE don't need more residents, housing, retail or office space.

Please vote NO on this Conoco development, and instead concentrate on determining why businesses are leaving, and put in a plan to keep businesses in Louisville.

Louisville was twice one of the best cities to live in, if this development goes through it will definitely become one of the worst cities to live in !

Thanks,
Joel

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Red Tail Ridge

-----Original Message-----

From: Sharon Johnson [mailto:sharonjohnson656@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 11:55 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Red Tail Ridge

Dear Planning Commission Members:

Thank you for taking the time to request and heed input from your community.

My concerns regarding the Red Tail Ridge development are many. Traffic on Dillon and Hwy 42 is already congested at times. Adding industry and 900 multi-family rental units would put an enormous strain on the current traffic problems. The Monarch School is very near and would be impacted in multiple ways: increased traffic and student danger, increase in student enrollment to over-capacity, to mention just two.

The industrial park that Louisville

currently has is very nice and able to accommodate additional industry, I believe.

Shopping malls are closing and are leaving empty buildings that could be and should be repurposed.

Louisville is a lovely small town. The community deserves to have the atmosphere preserved as much as possible by keeping open space available and congestion at a minimum.

Thank you for your service to our community.

Sharon Johnson
Sharonjohnson656@gmail.com
Sent from my iPhone

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Zaharias and Redtail Ridge

From: Carolyn Koehnen [<mailto:ckoehnen@gmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 11:29 AM

To: townboard@superiorcolorado.gov; Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Zaharias and Redtail Ridge

I am a three year Rock Creek Resident.

Please please do not allow zoning approval for the Zaharia/Redtail Ridge developments! Please no more rental units! Please work to buy up the property for open space. We residents would be most appreciative!

Carolyn Koehnen
2061 Emerson Ln, Louisville, CO 80027
303.841.6881

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Oppose Redtail Ridge development

-----Original Message-----

From: Brian Nordstrom Lane [mailto:bnordlane@icloud.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 8:42 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Oppose Redtail Ridge development

I oppose the Redtail Ridge development as proposed.

Brian Nordstrom Lane

Sent from my iPhone

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: redbtail ridge

From: Robyn Nordstrom Lane [<mailto:rnordstromlane@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 8:47 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: redbtail ridge

hello -

i am writing to state that i oppose the redbtail ridge development plan.

robyn nordstrom lane

louisville resident

Rob Zuccaro

Subject:

FW: Development plan for former Storage Tek site is WAY too big!

From: Rebecca Laverdure [<mailto:rebeccalaverdure@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 2:42 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Development plan for former Storage Tek site is WAY too big!

Dear Louisville Planning Commission,

Thank you for representing Louisville in looking at appropriate development plans for our beloved town. I'd like to express my concern about the plan for the former Storage Tek site and the Planned Unit Development.

Please vote no on the development plan and PUD on the agenda. The developer should have offered/should still offer a much smaller plan - a plan the size of what was approved for ConocoPhillips. The developer does not meet the criteria for a comprehensive plan change - "Our Livable Small Town Feel" will not remain intact with this current plan. To be honest, they can already build up to 3 million square feet under the current "rural" designation. That is enough! We've decided we love our small-town feel and it's time to make decisions consistent with that intent. We don't need 900 more multi-family rental units because that would increase rental units to about 45% of Louisville's housing stock and that will make us actually lose tax base.

Thank you again for representing us and for taking our past decisions about the tenor and feel of our community into consideration as you vote on this proposal.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Laverdure

Louisville Resident and Teacher

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Property Development Plan

From: Jessica Lawrence [<mailto:jeslawrence@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 8:13 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Property Development Plan

Dear Louisville Planning Commission,

Thank you for representing Louisville in looking at appropriate development plans for our beloved town. I'd like to express my concern about the plan for the former Storage Tek site and the Planned Unit Development.

Please vote no on the development plan and PUD on the agenda. The developer should have offered/should still offer a much smaller plan - a plan the size of what was approved for ConocoPhillips. The developer does not meet the criteria for a comprehensive plan change - "Our Livable Small Town Feel" will not remain intact with this current plan. To be honest, they can already build up to 3 million square feet under the current "rural" designation. That is enough! We've decided we love our small-town feel and it's time to make decisions consistent with that intent. We don't need 900 more multi-family rental units because that would increase rental units to about 45% of Louisville's housing stock and that will make us actually lose tax base.

Thank you again for representing us and for taking our past decisions about the tenor and feel of our community into consideration as you vote on this proposal.

Sincerely,

Jessica Lawrence
Louisville Resident and Teacher

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge
Attachments: PLANNING COMMISSION REDTAIL.docx; ATT00001.htm; Newsweek.docx; ATT00002.htm; McKnight'sSeniorLiving.docx; ATT00003.htm

From: John Leary [<mailto:johntleary@comcast.net>]
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2020 3:05 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

Members of the Planning Commission,

My comments to you at your meeting of last week were very poorly presented. Attached you will find the notes for my comments that may help you understand their meaning.

I further beg your patience with the following comments:

The applicant justifies the density and land-use mix proposed for the project by claiming they are needed to finance project infrastructure. Whereas, there are certainly some fixed costs involved, redesigning the project to fit the 2.5 million square feet of commercial development allowed by the current GDP/zoning, the costs of infrastructure could be greatly reduced. (Just think about the savings from street redesign, utility infrastructure and water rights). Again, doing this would have significant financial benefits to the City of Louisville and its taxpayers. Furthermore, in February, the City Council approved a service plan for the Redtail Ridge Metropolitan District that projected a levy of 30 mils would be necessary to construct the district's infrastructure. Despite this projection, the Council granted the district the authority to set a mil levy of up to 60 mils, with 50 mils available for infrastructure. So what do we have here? We have a rezoning proposal that is designed around maximizing profit and reducing risk for the applicant. At the same time, the citizens of Louisville are being asked to accept less tax revenue, accept risk, and absorb the impacts, traffic, etc., associated with a high-density development.

Moving on to the issue of Medtronics, there is little, if any, opposition to Medtronics building on the site. They can build with the existing GDP/zoning.

Now, I am going to add some comments on selected issues raised at your meeting by members of the Commission.

Commissioner Diehl raised the following issues:

- *The use of the capital projects surplus shown in Figure 17.* Most of this surplus is likely a result of the one-time construction use tax. Rob correctly said most of this would not be needed for things like streets in the 1st 20 years. However, it could be needed in the 25 year. But the main issue here is the nature of capital spending. We all pay into the capital projects fund when we buy goods or services subject to our sales tax. It may be 20 years down the road before the street in front of our house is paved. But again, the major issue here is that one time revenues, while having benefits, are not, and should not and should not be, used for annual operating expenses.

- *He questioned whether the current environment was good for senior living facilities.* I assumed he was talking about the Covid-19 and recession. If he was, he did not get a good answer. If that was not his intent, I apologize, but anyway, attached are two articles on the subject. The first (from Newsweek) deals with Erickson Living's bankruptcy during the 2008 recession. (I expect you know they are owned by Redwood Capital Investment the winning bidder in their bankruptcy sale). The second article (from McNights Senior Living) deals with the financial impact of Covid-19 on senior living facilities.

Commissioner Rice raised the following issue:

- *Why is residential development causing such a negative impact on this development?* Rob correctly identified sales tax leakage as a major factor. Another major factor is the value of multi-family units in the proposal. A residential unit with a value considerably in excess of the average residential unit value in Louisville, could have no impact, or a positive impact, on City finances. The units being proposed for Redtail Ridge have a value less than the average home value in Louisville.

Commissioner Williams raised this issue.

- *Is it right that the development Comprehensive Plan involves extensive public involvement and changing the Plan has limited public input?* This is a problem with the system. Members of the public spent hours in meetings shaping the 2013 Comprehensive Plan. We are now participating from the sidelines with our three minutes and emails. Early in the 2013 process there was discussion of the need to focus on the StorageTek land. The alternative use on the table was to allow residential development on the parcel. It was ruled out, without dissent, for two reasons: 1) Sales tax leakage and 2) it would become a satellite community to the rest of Louisville. Neither situation has changed. The issue of residential at the site also came up in the plan developed previous to the 2013 Plan. A consultant proposed building around 850 units which also went nowhere with the public.

Finally, in 1983 I was on the City Council that added the Planned Community Zoned District zoning to our municipal code. It was done with much hesitation. Now, the only other member of that Council and I, often bemoan this action as one of the biggest mistakes we made during our tenure. The fear at the time was that it would undermine comprehensive planning and the power of zoning, by putting a focus on developing large, individual parcels at the expense of the big picture. It has done that. The resulting incremental planning approach has undermined the utilization of Section 17.44.050 of our municipal code titled "Declaration of policy for rezoning."

Thanks for your time and service,

John Leary
1116 Lafarge Ave

PLANNING COMMISSION REDTAIL

Last week I sent you written comments on the Redtail Ridge Comp Plan and GDP amendments. I made the following points:

- Our Comp Plan must have the goal of creating a land use mixture that will produce a fiscally sustainable city.
- Long-term fiscal sustainability is driven by our revenue structure and not by fiscal modeling.
- Our revenue structure is heavily dependent upon sales tax generated by our commercial sector via non-resident spending. This nonresident spending produces 55% - 60% of our sales tax revenue with residents providing the remaining 40 - 45%. We also get strong contributions of property and consumer use taxes from this commercial sector.
- Recent land-use decisions involving a commercial/residential mix have resulted in commercial land being repurposed to residential development to the financial peril of the City.

I call your attention to Figure 17 on page 28 of the staff report.

Look at the net fiscal results by fund section at the bottom of the figure.

The first three lines represent the net benefit to the operations part of the City Budget, i.e., services such as Police, Recreation, Parks, Public Works, etc.

The By Right column of the figure represents the current GDP or zoning granted to ConocoPhillips. As you can see the **existing zoning on the property (office development at a rural density) produces more net benefit to the City's operating budget than does Redtail Ridge**. You can see how tenuous the fiscal benefits are for Redtail; if it only builds

out to 80%, it would cost more to provide it services than we would receive in revenue.

I am skipping Debt Service Fund since it is roughly the same between scenarios, and moving on to the Capital Projects Fund about which I will make two points:

- 1) The Capital Project Fund surplus is likely from the construction use tax. While operating revenues are generated annually the construction use tax is one-time. As such, it is misleading to add these funds together.
- 2) It is against City Policy to use one-time revenues for annual operating costs.

Now, it is important to note the existing GDP, i.e., zoning, has a development level that is not the max allowed by its Comp Plan designation. It could be 27 % higher. If the GDP was amended to allow the full potential of the zoning category, the benefits to the operation budget from the current zoning would be nearly twice that of Redtail Ridge. Again, this is because of our revenue structure, and the fact residential development does not pay its way.

It is in the City's financial interest to stay with the current zoning.

Search...Submit

[Home](#) > [News](#)

Publish Date May 29, 2020

Impact of COVID-19 on senior living could be \$50 billion, Argentum CEO says



Kimberly Bonvissuto

- [Share by Email](#)

The impact of COVID-19 on the senior living industry could be \$40 billion to \$50 billion over the next year, Argentum President and CEO James Balda said Wednesday in a Yahoo Finance interview.

The estimate echoes one made last month when Argentum and the American Seniors Housing Association sent a [letter](#) to Health and Human Services Secretary Alex Azar asking for \$20 billion from the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act for companies operating independent living, assisted living, memory care and continuing care retirement communities.



Argentum President and CEO James Balda

“The impact on our industry could be anywhere from \$40 [billion] to over \$50 billion over the next 12 months. And this crisis will continue in our communities for the next 12 months until, ultimately, there is a vaccine,” Balda said Wednesday. “We’ve been working with Congress, as well as the White House and the administration, to make the case that our providers need financial support just as the hospitals had received support and just as skilled nursing facilities had received support.”

Senior living providers are doing everything they can to protect their residents during the COVID-19 crisis, Balda said, but those actions come at a cost, including escalating expenses for staffing and supplies.

“We’ve really been advocating to make sure that our providers get access to funding to help offset these costs,” he told Yahoo Finance’s [On The Move](#) panel.

The industry is seeing effects on both the revenue and expense side, the CEO said. Projections show labor costs increasing by more than 20% and supply costs increasing by more than 100%, Balda added. At the same time, communities have limited access to buildings and have restricted move-ins to prevent or contain the virus, moves that have led to a decrease in income.

One concern is that, as the country begins to open up and people’s lives return to a new normal, senior living communities will “continue to be in crisis mode” as they try to protect their residents, he said.

Long term, however, Balda said the prospects for the industry are positive, adding that people choose to move into senior living communities for the supports they need and the socialization they want.

Looking to the future, Balda said there have been discussions about the physical structure of buildings on new projects and that operators will continue with enhanced infection control protocols.

Senior living communities will have more positive outcomes than nursing homes largely due to that physical structure of the buildings, he predicted. Although nursing home residents often share rooms, senior living residents typically have their own apartments, allowing them to self-quarantine or isolate if necessary, Balda said.

In other coronavirus-related news:

- As the death toll in long-term care rises and COVID-19 testing capacity slowly expands, [states](#) are each crafting new testing policies to prevent and contain outbreaks in facilities, where more than half of coronavirus deaths have occurred in many states. In New Jersey, for instance, a directive required assisted living communities and other settings to provide COVID-19 baseline testing of all staff and residents by May 26.
- Long-term care facilities have become a flashpoint in the COVID-19 pandemic, with high infection rates and low staffing exacerbated by the demands of the pandemic. A professor of mechanical and industrial engineering at Northeastern University and her doctoral students joined a [team](#) to make the hiring process more efficient.
- As Massachusetts discloses the death toll by nursing home, multiple [gaps](#) exist in the data, suggesting that the number of deaths in senior care is much higher than the numbers say. Missing from the data are deaths at assisted living communities and publicly financed senior living residences, which are home to thousands of residents but have different regulators.
- The White House, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and states are debating the proper theoretical (and politically beneficial) way to tally COVID-19 deaths. What is needed is a single and clear national testing [strategy](#) outline who must be tested, when and with which test, according to an opinion piece published by the Kaiser Family Foundation.
- Carrie Kuhr, senior executive director of The Inn at Olentangy Trail and The Inn at Bear Trail in Columbus, OH, wrote a [letter](#) to the editor of the Columbus Dispatch about the need for funding of assisted living communities that are accumulating COVID-19-related costs.
- A French senior care home has developed a plastic “[happiness bubble](#)” to help residents safely see their loved ones and friends during the pandemic.
- Telehealth use by older adults during the coronavirus pandemic is still low, according to a pair of [surveys](#), even though seniors have access to the technology and those who are using telehealth are giving it high marks.

BUSINESS

BANKRUPTCY HITS RETIREMENT HOMES

BY **LINDA STERN** ON 11/23/09 AT 7:00 PM EST

SHARE

BUSINESS

The recession is hitting elderly people where they live, literally. Financial problems have been mounting at a number of assisted-living and continuing-care communities, forcing some facilities into bankruptcies and inflicting new worries on residents and their families who thought their life plans were comfortably set. In recent weeks, Erickson Retirement Communities, which manages 19 continuing-care retirement communities in 11 states, declared bankruptcy. Sunrise Senior Living Inc. posted a quarterly loss of \$82 million and announced plans to sell off 21 of its assisted-living communities. Nationally, smaller retirement communities are raising their prices, changing the way they operate, selling themselves off to bigger chains, or getting out of the business altogether. Many companies say they can't make a profit—or even succeed on a nonprofit basis—in an environment that combines the high cost of caring for elderly residents, restrictive Medicaid budgets, tight credit markets and fewer residents willing and able to pay top dollar for their care.

When a facility fails, it can have myriad effects on the residents. The good news is that no one gets kicked to the curb—at least not right away. "Nobody has ended up on the street, which is a primal fear when you're dealing with these places," says Jason Frank, an elder-law attorney in Baltimore. "But their fees can skyrocket, and they can become unaffordable. Then they can kick you out for nonpayment." In some cases, residents may find that the sizeable deposits they made to get their apartments in the first place have disappeared. (Continuing-care communities like Erickson's typically charge deposits of \$150,000 or more, and assure residents that they can stay on the campus for the rest of their lives regardless of how their needs change, and that the deposits will be refundable

to themselves or their heirs when they leave or die. But residents typically also have to pay monthly fees for care, and those fees can continue to increase. Assisted-living facilities like Sunrise generally require no deposits but charge a monthly pay-as-you-go-plan.) That's what happened to the 170 people who lived in Covenant at South Hills in Lebanon, Pa. Their deposits went up in smoke when their facility was sold in bankruptcy to Concordia Lutheran Ministries, which did not take on that liability. Several are now suing B'nai Brith Housing, the original operator of Covenant.

Erickson executives say that their bankruptcy filing will have no impact on residents. "We've refunded every single deposit in our 26-year history," says Tom Neubauer, the firm's executive vice president of sales. "People moving in are completely unaffected by all this." Erickson's corporate organization is complex, with each community (and that community's deposits) owned by a separate nonprofit entity that is not part of the bankruptcy filing.

But residents could face disruptions. Newer communities that haven't been completely built out yet may not have their assisted-living and nursing-home wings, so residents who need higher levels of care may end up being transferred to other facilities. Should various nonprofits not be able to resell units at the same price as the original buyers paid, those original buyers might not get their deposits back. And residents who run through their personal savings and their deposits paying for ever-higher levels of care will have to depend on an optional "benevolent fund" to cover their expenses.

Erickson has a solid reputation and good track record for keeping residents for the rest of their lives, but anyone shopping for retirement housing now should think thrice about the financial risks of their arrangements. "You've got to keep your eyes open," says Eric Carlson, director of the long-term-care project for the National Senior Citizens Law Center. "If you look at the agreements, sometimes what you're being promised is not that much. The provider may be reserving the right to force you to leave for various reasons." Often there's a generic "can't meet your needs" clause in the contract.

He recommends that refundable deposits be set aside in escrow accounts, and that anyone signing a long-term-care contract run it by an elderlaw attorney first. (They can be found at the [National Academy of Elderlaw Attorneys](#).) His organization also has an [online](#)

[checklist of questions](#) that should be asked before moving into a retirement or assisted-living community.

Carlson also says he generally prefers the financial advantages of the pay-as-you-go models, but even consumers who choose facilities that only charge rent on a monthly basis may not be saving their nest eggs for long. Sunrise has raised prices as it has gone through several quarters of financial trouble. It can cost \$6,000 or more a month for quality assisted living, and \$9,000 for nursing-home care. At those rates, it's not hard to run through life savings in a hurry, and then not every assisted-living facility will keep you. Many don't take Medicaid or other subsidies, and some facilities that had taken Medicaid have switched to no-Medicaid policies. That leaves those residents who have no assets with no place to live. Nationally, discharge-related complaints about nursing homes and assisted-living facilities have doubled in a decade—to 12,237 in 2008, according to the U.S. Administration on Aging. It's now the second-most-common complaint at nursing homes, behind "failure to respond to requests for assistance." And it's the third-most-common complaint at assisted-living facilities, behind problems with medication administration and disappointment with the food.

Complicated state rules can then force newly impoverished residents to go into nursing homes for at least a month so they can qualify for Medicaid, and then back out into another assisted-living facility, says Beverley Laubert, the long-term-care ombudsman for Ohio and president of the National Association of State Long-Term Care Ombudsman Programs. She and her colleagues are called in when facilities declare bankruptcy or force residents to relocate because of policy changes, but usually they can't force facilities to keep residents. Instead, they spend much of their time helping residents who thought they'd found their final homes look for new places to live in a market where, now, nothing is certain.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Development

From: Jennifer Levin [<mailto:jenniferlevin14@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 11:52 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge Development

Dear Commissioners:

I am a 15 year resident and home owner in downtown Louisville. Please consider my comments below with the above-referenced subject matter:

- 1) This development is too big. The developer should come back with a plan the size of what was approved for ConocoPhillips, which is already a generous 60% bigger than Storage Tek
- 2) Please vote no on the development plan and PUD on the agenda.
- 3) The developer does not meet the criteria for a comprehensive plan change.
- 4) Louisville does not need 900 more multi-family rental units which are essentially out of town, will increase rental units to about 45% of Louisville's housing stock and will make the city actually lose tax base.
- 5) This development will burden our educators and education system with over-populated classrooms.

Thank you,

Jennifer Levin
732 Jefferson Avenue
Louisville, CO 80027
303-330-2549

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Regarding the Redtail Ridge Development

From: Marty McCloskey [<mailto:martymccloskey@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 8:25 PM

To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>

Cc: Ashley Stolzmann <ashleys@louisvilleco.gov>; City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Regarding the Redtail Ridge Development

Dear Planning Commission,

As longtime residents of this beautiful small town, Louisville Colorado, we wish to voice our opposition to this massive development project. From concerns about increased traffic patterns, water usage, additional and unnecessary retail space, impact on wildlife, and many other aspects, this project will not contribute in a positive way to the character of Louisville.

Considering all aspects of this project, the negatives far outweigh the positives, and we hope that you will give due consideration to the current residents of Louisville, and not be overly swayed by the commercial interests of the developer and their associated businesses.

Thank you.

Kim and Marty McCloskey
767 Club Circle
Louisville, CO 80027

cc: Ashley Stolzmann
Louisville City Council

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: RedTail Development

From: Stephanie Neville [mailto:s_a_neville@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 8:50 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: RedTail Development

Hello,

I might have a naive question, but I'm assuming Louisville's Comprehensive Plan as well as building requirements are open documents and available to the public. If this is the case, why have the RedTail developers submitted a plan (which I would expect they would like approval for) which for the most part doesn't align with the plan? They seem to be expecting an extensive number of exemptions.

The approved and voted for plan is for guidance purposes?

Have all aspects of the financial liabilities for the city been accounted for?

What if all, half or even a quarter of the new residents shop in Broomfield? What types of commercial businesses will utilize this new space? How much new tax revenue will be guaranteed each year versus infrastructure cost to the city?

What if the developer goes bankrupt?

I'm assuming these questions along with many others will be addressed at the meeting.

Regards,
Stephanie McLaughlan

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Proposal

From: B McQuie [<mailto:bmcquie@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 8:21 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>; McQuie, Jerome <jmcquie@gmail.com>; Beth McQuie <bmcquie@yahoo.com>

Subject: Redtail Ridge Proposal

Dear Planning Commission,

We are writing in opposition to the Redtail Ridge Proposal.

We oppose it for the following reasons:

- Such as major development should not be rushed through while much of the population is still isolating themselves and avoiding public meetings. Discussion of this should get a lot of publicity and meetings should be held when citizens can attend in person.
- Allowing such a huge increase in population, of up to 3,000 new residents, would substantially change the character of Louisville. We do not support that.
- The current plan would allow buildings up to 5 stories high. That is much higher than anything currently in Louisville and it would not fit in with our small-town character. It would block views and seem like a big city.
- Allowing density limits to double would have a substantial impact on Louisville. The proposal seeks to re-designate the property allowing an increase from a FAR (floor area to lot size ratio) of 0.25 to 0.5. Again, this is more than double the amount of development currently allowed in the current GDP.
- Traffic would increase quite a bit in Louisville, especially around Monarch schools. This would deteriorate the quality of life for current residents. It would also add to noise and to air pollution.
- The senior housing would be expensive, with monthly fees of \$2800-\$3800, probably more than most Louisville residents could afford. (Data from Wind Crest Pricing Guide 2020 – the Louisville facility would be operated by the same company). This would not benefit current residents.
- Wildlife would be impacted by all the development and traffic. The area currently has nesting raptors, other birds and prairie dogs. Where would they go?

This development would benefit only the developers while the residents of Louisville would suffer. Please do not move forward with this.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Beth and Jerry McQuie

972 Saint Andrews Lane

Louisville, CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

From: William G Mertens [<mailto:mertens@colorado.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 9:20 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

To Whom It May Concern:,

I would like to express my displeasure with the Redtail Ridge proposal. The development plan goes against everything our town (and its comprehensive plan) stand for. It is an enormous development that we simply don't need. Please vote against the plan.

Billy Mertens
917 Eldorado Lane

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge development proposal

From: Danajoy Monroe [<mailto:djzmonroe@gmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 5:49 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge development proposal

To the Louisville Planning Commission,

Monday June 22, 2020

My name is Danajoy Zoe Monroe and I live in the Coal Creek Ranch subdivision, I bought my house in 1996.

I highly object to this massive Redtail Ridge development proposal. It will ruin the quality of life for Louisville residents. Especially so for families that live near this project. There will be pollution, traffic, noise and the permanent loss of a small town lifestyle that will be gone forever.

I object to the scale of this project and the removal of height restrictions on the buildings, and removal of the rural status for that land.

I didn't even know this was happening till my neighbor told me about this. A letter should be sent to everyone who owns property here in Louisville. Also, it should be voted on by the residents in a true election. This is just wrong to vote this through without everyone even knowing about it!

What happens when we have another drought? I have lived through water shortages and water rates going up and up. We do not have the resources to support this. Also, I expect the current homeowners will foot the bill, along with the loss of our property values. If I wanted to live in New York city that is where I would live! We have been voted the best little town to live in, many times. Now you are throwing it all out the window! For what? More money? People with Asthma can hardly deal with the air pollution as it is, what about our children? What about climate change? This project will add lots of black top roads and buildings that will heat this area up even more! This project will put climate change in overdrive for our little town. It is already unbearably hot and dry in the summers as it is. You build this project and the residents of Louisville will be dealing with health issues from pollution. What about the roads, water and sewer systems? There is so much that will be impacted. What about the environment, the wildlife and natural plants and natural fields that help keep this area cooler? What about the natural land, green space buffer we have now that separates us from Broomfield? If this goes through with will be a megalopolis.

I highly object to this massive Redtail Ridge Development proposal!

Thank you
Danajoy Zoe Monroe
470 Muirfield Cir
Louisville CO 80027
303-944-6199

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Development

From: Richard Morgan [<mailto:richardmorgan644@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 11:23 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Redtail Ridge Development

Members of the Planning Commission:

It's my understanding that the Commission at its meeting this Thursday will be revisiting the request from the developer of Red Tail Ridge to amend the Comprehensive Development Plan. **As a 20+ year resident of Louisville, I am reiterating my family's support for this project and the very thoughtful development that is planned for the site.** The developer has held many focus meetings with the community and it has incorporated critical feedback into the project plan.

There can be no doubt that opening up this site to business and commerce will have major benefits to the City's long-term fiscal health, which today, notwithstanding the impacts of COVID closures, has been significantly impaired due to large and small businesses vacating or closing (Kohl's, Sam's Club, Lowes?, etc.). Moreover, this ideally located site can attract companies with higher paying jobs (Medtronic, etc.) that otherwise would locate in neighboring communities, mainly Broomfield. Improving access to the site, enhancing circulation, and transportation will massively benefit Avista and Monarch schools, local business, neighbors, and Louisville Fire and Police. Adding a few more residents to the area who pay use and sales taxes, patronize Louisville businesses, and enhance the character and diversity of our city, arguably outweigh the negligible cost in city services they supposedly consume. Not to be overlooked, Louisville residents will also benefit greatly by the many acres of once private open space and new trail systems that will be dedicated to the City, making this site a realized community benefit.

Planning Commissioners must consider the 4 requirements to change the Comprehensive Plan (See Sec. 17.64.070 - Criteria for amendment):

- A. The amendment request is consistent with the goals, policies and intent of the comprehensive plan of the City.
- B. The amendment request will not result in adverse impacts to existing or planned services to the citizens of the City.
- C. The amendment request demonstrates a need exists for the amendment through either changed conditions or past error which support adjustments to the City's comprehensive plan.
- D. The planning commission and/or city council may consider other factors in reviewing an application as they deem appropriate and may request additional information which is necessary for an adequate review and evaluation of the amendment.

Strong arguments can be made to support each of these 4 criteria. I urge the Commission to **vote to approve** the amendment of the comprehensive plan to permit the development of Red Tail Ridge. Now is the time to unlock the potential of this site and create a true community asset.

Thank you,
Richard Morgan

Richard Morgan
303.956.8188 (cell)
www.linkedin.com/in/morganrichardb

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Richard Morgan** <richardmorgan644@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jun 8, 2020 at 7:44 PM
Subject: Redtail Ridge Development
To: <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Dear Planning Commission Members:

My name is Richard Morgan. For over 20 years, my family and I have resided at 644 W Pine St, Louisville.

As a Louisville resident for many years, I support the Redtail Ridge Project and the General Development Plan. The plan strikes the right balance between the need to invest in Louisville's future, while still maintaining a livable, innovative and economically diverse community. Brue Baukol Capital Partners, the developer, has held numerous meetings with the community and modified its plans several times to accommodate the many ideas and voices from the community. The mix of uses fills much needed voids in our city, such as the senior living facility, more affordable housing, a large employer to anchor the project, and high-paying jobs. They have focused on traffic improvements to ameliorate circulation issues around and through the property. They have added open space, ball fields, recreation amenities, and trails connecting neighborhoods. Finally, and perhaps most important, it converts a stagnant land parcel into a city revenue generating asset. In a post-COVID world, our Louisville community will need to generate revenue from every possible asset.

Please vote in favor of this crown jewel community asset.

Thank you,
Richard Morgan

Richard Morgan
303.956.8188 (cell)
www.linkedin.com/in/morganrichardb

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

From: Maxine Most [<mailto:cmoxmost@me.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 9:27 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>; City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge

I am opposed to Redtail Ridge development as currently proposed.

Beyond the multitude of reasons why this enormous project is not consistent with Louisville nor good for our community Including :

- expansions of size of development based on initial public proposals
- height of buildings, and
- inclusion of residential units, again not included in the initial plan,

There are many other serious concerns about this project:

- There has been no Cost/benefit analysts that fully considers all short and long term impacts on traffic, infrastructure, wildlife, environmental, schools, property taxes. We simply have no idea what this development will “cost” Louisville.
- Given that we have no idea what the long term ramifications of the pandemic will be on housing, hospitality, Senior Living, recreation spaces, Louisville would be wise to not rush into approval for massive development that might be inconsistent with emerging trends and best practices.
- The idea of providing tax incentives to an offshore corporation with \$4B in profit at a time when our local budget is stressed makes no fiscal sense - especially when we dint understand the true cost of this development
- Relying on this development to address safety issues at Monarch K-8 and High is an unacceptable abdication of responsibility by the City Louisville and BVSD to futile their primary obligation to the safety and well being of the children in our community.

And finally and perhaps most importantly, where Louisville is going to come up with the water required fir all these businesses and homes after 15 years of drought that shows no signs of easing?

This is the wrong project, at the wrong time for our community.

C. Maxine Most
640 W Linden St
Louisville
720 530 5836
Sent from my iPhone

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW:
Attachments: text_1593012478689.txt

From: +13038592549@tmomail.net [<mailto:+13038592549@tmomail.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 9:29 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject:

Hello this is Arnie Mullen I live at 235 Dahlia Drive in Lewisville hello this is Ernie Mullen I live at 235 Dahlia Drive in Louisville I'm asking you to please vote against the Bruce Paco project at red tail Ridge I think it's way too big but development for Louisville these developments are Ponzi scheme it always cost taxpayers a lot more than the tax revenue that is generated I'm in Economist of studied this issue with the Economist magazine says that these developments never pay for them themselves will be stuck 20 years later with empty buildings and new infrastructure cost to repay the streets to fix the water lines to build more schools etcetera so please vote against it my phone number is 303-859-2549 thank you



This message was sent to you by a T-Mobile wireless phone.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Oppose Redtail Ridge Plan

From: William Nelson [<mailto:williamharrynelson@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 8:39 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Re: Oppose Redtail Ridge Plan

I forgot to include my address below.

On Tue, Jun 23, 2020 at 8:37 AM William Nelson <williamharrynelson@gmail.com> wrote:

Good Morning,

I wanted to write and state my opposition to the proposed plan for Redtail Ridge. It is significantly larger than what was originally approved for Phillips Conoco. I would also question if the developer has met all of the criteria for a comprehensive plan change. While the city does need to improve its tax base, the current proposed plan goes way beyond what is acceptable from a density, environmental and traffic perspective.

Please ask that the developer meet all the criteria for a plan change and reduce the footprint of hte development.

Regards,
Bill Nelson

714 Peach Court
Louisville, CO

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Development proposal - do not act

From: Stephanie Nevarez [<mailto:stephanie.nevarez@bvsd.org>]

Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 4:27 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Development proposal - do not act

Please postpone the decision to develop this area and leave it alone for now. The value will not diminish.

1903 Garfield Ave Louisville

Rob Zuccaro

Subject:

FW: Re-Development @ Storage Tech Site

From: William ODonnell [<mailto:billyod444@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 4:08 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Re-Development @ Storage Tech Site

These are my comments on the previously presented latest version of the proposal for the above referenced project. My input is based on being a resident of Louisville since 1988 (including serving on several community organizations & boards) as well as having 45 years experience as a environmental engineer holding LEED AP credentials and being a Value Engineering professional.

My thoughts are presented as public input to add to the choir of concerns by your commission & the citizen's. As usual with Developers and their proposals this current proposal appears to be an "opening" approach (built on the previous developers conceptual plan) and thus ripe for modifications to better realistically benefit Louisville. What has been the input from Boulder County, the US 36 Council of Mayors, the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG), etc?

- Proposed Corporate Headquarters & Senior Living Facility-Need binding commitment.
 - ~Appear to be appropriate for site, based on previous use, demographics & location, subject, of course, to refinements and addressing proper planning, design & construction.
 - ~Before any Preliminary approval or rezoning is considered further, a legally binding commitment document, preferably with a performance bond, needs to be filed by each of those parties & approved by City & County governing boards . This will assist in mitigating any sudden " changes" by those entities for whatever "reasons".
- Additional Regional Traffic & Public Transit Improvements are Required- Need definitive financing:
 - ~ An intergovernmental agreements, especially with Broomfield, is needed to define commitments (including cost sharing) & basic timeline for portions of the project not performed by the Developer.
- Proposed Additional Residents (beyond those in Senior Living Facility)-Too much for our little Town.
 - ~the projected increase of Louisville population is unrealistic based on it's negative impact on maintaining the highly valued "small town" aspects of our City
 - ~ projected residences do not seem to have been planned in conjunction with current Louisville transportation planning & in fact would be isolated from most of the City
 - ~ Were realistic affordable housing aspects considered?
 - ~ Developer needs to clearly define why aspect this proposed residences was added
- Proposed Additional Office Space (beyond projected corporate headquarters)-No market for them?
 - ~as the pandemic has shown us, commercial office real estate has & will continue to be reduced as " work from home" continues, and expand
 - as with comments on the proposed residences:
 - >need explained how the Louisville transportation plan was considered.
 - >Developer needs to clearly define why offices were added
- Proposed Added Retail & Food places - not financially viable after working hours

- Proposed Special District- This is always a questionable means for developers to shift costs to others , with those others having little input in how those costs are arrived at or allocated. (Please reference recent Denver Post series on this subject)
- Other Considerations, especially relevant to this day & age, would include those beyond current regulations & planning documents, such as:
 - ~ Sustainability?
 - ~ Realistic alternatives to automobile use? (the small tram system at Flatirons Crossing never was viable).
 - ~ Impacts on Louisville, & means to compensate for them? (Not using a Special District): Including, but not limited to: Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, Stormwater, other Public Works, especially the cost of upgrades and operations & maintenance), Recreation & Senior Center, Public Safety (Police, Fire, Ambulance) other municipal services (including Library)
 - ~ Impacts on, and means to mitigate, effects on surrounding environment , including wildlife
 - ~ Impacts on Monarch Middle & High Schools

In Summary:

- Appropriate: the conceptual planning for the proposed senior living facility & corporate headquarters
- Not Appropriate:
 - ~Additional offices
 - ~ Additional Residences
 - ~ Retail & Food Establishments (beyond that to directly support of Senior & Corporate facilities)
- All subject to proper detailed planning, design, construction operations & maintenance,' of the approved facilities and surroundings in compliance with all regulations & best practices with consideration for insuring the ongoing social, environmental & fiscal well being of Louisville & it's residents.

Thank you for your review and input & time & energy spent on this very a important matter. I would be happy to add my expertise to any subcommittees if so desired. Feel free to contact me if I further discussion is warranted.

William (Billy) O'Donnell
 444 Owl Dr, Louisville, CO 80027
 303-229-0700
billyod444@gmail.com

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Storagetech Site

From: Elizabeth Otto [<mailto:elzbeth.otto@aim.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 8:41 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Storagetech Site

I am particularly concerned that the proposed development for the Storagetech property does not include any environmental sustainability improvements, i.e. active and passive solar, xeriscaped landscaping, etc. No development in Louisville should go forward without these.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Otto
538 W. Sycamore Circle
Louisville

Elizabeth Otto elzbeth.otto@aim.com

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: I'm opposed to the huge new StorageTek development

From: Richard Forrest Phillips [<mailto:rfphill@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 1:31 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: I'm opposed to the huge new StorageTek development

I'm opposed to the huge new StorageTek development

Richard Phillips
377 Centennial Dr
Louisville, CO

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Red Tail Ridge

From: jetboulder@aol.com [<mailto:jetboulder@aol.com>]

Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 12:08 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Red Tail Ridge

My name is Mike Putney, and I live at 691 West Street, in Louisville. I have lived in Louisville since 1993. I am writing to strongly OPPOSE the General Development Plan and PUD Bruce Baukol Capital Partners is proposing. This proposal would significantly increase the traffic and would subsequently increase the emissions of Ozone precursors. Boulder County is currently part of a serious non-attainment area for ozone, and developments like the proposed project will only make it worse. I wasn't surprised to hear that Boulder County does not support the proposal, and that the proposal is contrary to the intent of the Northwest Parkway Intergovernmental Agreement. The Louisville Planning Commission should encourage and promote regional cooperation and coordination in working with other entities and jurisdictions. Thanks!

Mike Putney
691 West Street
Louisville, CO

June 23, 2020

Dear Commissioners,

Please consider these points before making a decision on the proposed development of Redtail Ridge.

The world doesn't need more "Happy Valley Estates". Is it nothing but empty platitudes when we profess to respect all living things on earth, and pledge to protect our children's futures? How long can we continue with such blatant disregard for the value of life on this planet, turning a blind eye to the limits of these resources? Platitudes are no longer good enough. We must live true to our convictions.

Is it actually being suggested that we partner with a giant fossil fuel corporation even as we struggle to rid ourselves of their chokehold on our society?

All over America progressive thinkers are running for offices with a Green New Deal as part of their platform. How can we propose to climb into bed with an oil and gas company that has made ZERO investments in renewable resources, alternative energy sources, or sustainable practices. The suburban development as proposed shows us nothing of forward thinking! It is more of the same fixation on the short-term economic benefit with willful ignorance of the disastrous long term real costs. What we are looking at here is a reckless waste of resources, both financial and natural.

If we feel compelled to sacrifice this lovely little enclave as it busily returns to a natural state, let's at least make it worthy. Use this as the rare opportunity to do something truly remarkable. Imagine the impact if we were to build a totally sustainable development!!!

The situation is perfect for it. It will demonstrate in real life how Louisville Government cares not only for the town, but for the planet; not only in the present, but also the future.

This “project of a green new future” will also give ConocoPhillips a chance to add sustainable practices, and alternative, renewable energy to its portfolio in an unparalleled way! It would put ConocoPhillips in the enviable position of being a leader of movement into the future! It is undeniable that things must change in a much bigger and faster way than they have up to this point.

It’s time for us to get on the bus or get the hell out of the way!!

Please, please Commissioners, don’t squander a golden ticket! This could be a showpiece for Colorado, the Southwest, maybe even the whole USA. Think of it as blazing a trail into the green new future.

Why would we waste this unprecedented gift by creating yet another suburban development of no true merit??

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gaylynn Potemkin

505 Spruce St.

Louisville, CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail / Nawatny Ridge Comments

From: Frederico R [<mailto:frederico@mac.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 4:16 AM

To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail / Nawatny Ridge Comments

Please, please, please, please, do not destroy some of the last open space beauty in Louisville by allowing this atrocious project to go through; and, seriously, where will you get the water to support this devastating overgrowth?

This is an ugly money/land-grab; I know the city is hurting from lost tax revenue, but this isn't a good reason to keep developing! Open space means property values remain higher.

Please reconsider. If not, the residents are already organizing for a referendum.

Frederico Russo
1240 West Hecla Drive
Unit 102
Louisville, CO 80027-2490
720.663.7426
frederico@mac.com

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail

-----Original Message-----

From: Marci Sannes [mailto:marci.sannes@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 3:58 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail

I again wanted to voice my concern about this proposed development. I am opposed to changing the RURAL designation of this property - which was agreed upon initially upon careful consideration. The citizens of Louisville are very upset that the commission appears to be bowing to corporate pressure rather than listening to the people. This property needs to remain designated as rural. No one in this town wants to see this huge development occur - go back to the previously approved plans. Thank you.

Marci Sannes
803 W Mulberry St (17 years)
Louisville CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Concern

From: Greg Shaffer [<mailto:grgshfr@gmail.com>]

Sent: We

nesday, June 24, 2020 8:26 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge Concern

Regarding the Redtail Ridge development:

This will put even more pressure on the Louisville Rec Center and its staff. There's a significant shortage of lap swimming pool space in the general area, even with the long overdue rec center remodel. There has already been communication between the LRC, the Rec Center Advisory Board, the City Council and the general public regarding programming issues caused by high demand. Adding more housing will make the problem worse. How will the plans address this problem?

Thanks,
Greg Shaffer
247 Hoover Ct., Louisville, CO

Louisville Dolphins Swim Team Vice President
Monarch High School Assistant Swim Coach

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Consideration

From: Greg Shaffer [<mailto:grgshfr@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 11:05 AM

To: City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge Consideration

The developments of Redtail Ridge in Louisville and nearby Zaharias and Flatiron Marketplace will further strain the Louisville Rec Center and its staff, especially related to indoor aquatics. I'm well aware of the existing shortage of indoor pool space within the general area. The long overdue remodel of the LRC much improved the situation, but it's clear a shortage currently exists with our population numbers, interest and programming conflicts.

I encourage you to consider addressing this problem as part of the Redtail Ridge development. Swimming is the 4th most popular recreational activity in the United States and Colorado is one of the most active States. Based on my research, the Louisville Dolphins is the largest recreational summer swim team in the State of Colorado, and the neighboring Superior team is the second largest. Although the Dolphins utilize Memory Square, the athletes pay for lessons and regularly swim at the LRC as patrons, increasing demand. Many of these swimmers go on to staff the LRC in lifeguard positions. In addition, the City has a large number of adult lap swimmers and triathletes, with many being forced to drive miles to find a pool that meets their needs. And, we have a number of Senior Citizens who rely on water aerobics as their only means of exercise. Finally, the Monarch High School teams utilize the pool. Louisville is an aquatics town with a pool problem.

I personally would like to see the developers of Redtail Ridge build an indoor pool that will adequately cover the increase in demand now and into the future. Ideally, this would be an 8 lane, 25 meter indoor pool with a diving well.

Kind Regards,
Greg Shaffer
247 Hoover Ct., Louisville, CO

Vice President Louisville Dolphins
High School Assistant Swim Coach
Lap Swimmer

Subject: FW: Development Plan for former StorageTek Site

From: Jennifer Singer-Rupp [<mailto:jsingerrupp@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 10:36 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Development Plan for former StorageTek Site

Dear Louisville Planning Commission, Dear Louisville City Council,

I am writing again to renew my opposition to how the Red Tail Ridge development has evolved and urge you to vote against it in its current form. I urge you to NO on (i.e., reject) this development plan and PUD re-zoning from commercial/rural to suburban on the agenda for the June 25th meeting. I sat through the last Planning Commission meeting on June 11th, to be honest, in utter shock. For the good reason that this project is not consistent with Louisville's small town feel nor good for our community.

The re-zoning of such a huge property needs to be accompanied by public input and transparent analysis of the impact. The only communications to the public (previous to the June 11 meeting) were PR presentations hosted by Brue Braukol. The developer does not meet the criteria for a comprehensive plan change. The developer **must meet every one of the four criteria (listed below) for the Planning Commission to be able to vote yes.**

Comprehensive plan change requirements

"Sec. 17.64.070. - Criteria for amendment.

Before an amendment to the comprehensive plan may be adopted, it must be demonstrated that **each of the following criteria have been met** or are not applicable in order to approve the amendment:

- A. The amendment request is consistent with the goals, policies and intent of the comprehensive plan of the city; (See below for some comprehensive plan values.)
- B. The amendment request will not result in adverse impacts to existing or planned services to the citizens of the city;
- C. The amendment request demonstrates a need exists for the amendment through either changed conditions or past error which support adjustments to the city's comprehensive plan;
- D. The planning commission and/or city council may consider other factors in reviewing an application as they deem appropriate and may request additional information which is necessary for an adequate review and evaluation of the amendment." ("Other factors" can include public opinion.)

Here are some of the comprehensive plan "values" that show "intent" related to criterion A. above:

- "A Sense of Community . . . where residents, property owners, business owners, and visitors feel a connection to Louisville and to each other, and where the City's character, physical form and accessible government contribute to a citizenry that is actively involved in the decision-making process to meet their individual and collective needs
- Our Livable Small Town Feel . . . where the City's size, scale, and land use mixture and government's high-quality customer service encourage personal and commercial interactions. A Healthy, Vibrant, and Sustainable Economy . . . where the City understands and appreciates the trust our residents, property owners, and business owners place in it when they invest in Louisville, and where the City is committed to a strong and supportive business climate which fosters a healthy and vibrant local and regional economy for today and for the future.
- Sustainable Practices for the Economy, Community, and the Environment . . . where we challenge our government, residents, property owners, and our business owners to be innovative with sustainable practices so the needs of today are met without compromising the needs of future generations.
- Balanced Transportation System . . . where the City desires to make motorists, transit customers, bicyclists and pedestrians of all ages and abilities partners in mobility, and where the City intends to create and maintain a multimodal transportation system to ensure that each user can move in ways that contribute to the economic prosperity, public health, and exceptional quality of life in the City.

- Integrated Open Space and Trail Networks . . . where the City appreciates, manages and preserves the natural environment for community benefit, including its ecological diversity, its outstanding views, clear-cut boundaries, and the interconnected, integrated trail network which makes all parts of the City accessible.
- Ecological Diversity . . . where the City, through its management of parks and open space and its development and landscape regulations, promotes biodiversity by ensuring a healthy and resilient natural environment, robust plant life and diverse habitats.
- Open, Efficient and Fiscally Responsible Government . . . where the City government is approachable, transparent, and ethical, and our management of fiscal resources is accountable, trustworthy, and prudent.”

The expansion of size of the development is much too large. The proposal of 5 story buildings is absurd in the City of Louisville (I don't think we have any 5 story buildings) and the re-zoning to include residential units goes against the original intent of this property. There are many other serious concerns about this project including short and long term impacts on traffic, infrastructure, wildlife, pollution, environmental, schools, property taxes, and water availability and rates. It was even mentioned in the June 11 meeting that the proposed development would increase our population by 25% - straining our current water sources and forcing us to expand our water works (which costs taxpayer money). We have no idea what this development will “cost” Louisville.

I grew up in Louisville and was the first first grade class to attend Coal Creek Elementary School. My father's first job out of college was at StorageTek. I have seen growth in Louisville. But this project as it is currently being proposed will forever change our town character and push our public works capacities to their limit. One listener on June 11 spoke to the view when one drives in from Denver to Louisville. After back to back developments, when we drive past Louisville, we are greeted with fields and open space. It was mentioned that StorageTek was required to construct their buildings such that they did not take away from this view. The buildings blended into the grasses and were constructed so they were more out of view. I have seen no discussions, considerations, or adjustments made on the part of the developers to take this into consideration nor proposals by the City of Louisville in their desire to do this. This piece of land is Louisville's flagship. It is our advertisement of who we are as a community to all people driving past on 36th. Filling it with residential development to line the pockets of a few would be short-sighted and devastating to the community and future generations.

During the June 11 meeting, I noticed that the number of public attendees was never communicated. I would like to ask the Planning Commission to communicate the number of public attendees joining for the calling intermittently during the meeting. I would also ask you to take additional Public Comments during the June 25 meeting as many residents were previously not even aware of this proposal and should be given the opportunity to speak.

I ask that the Planning Commission please vote NO on (i.e., reject) this development plan and PUD on the agenda for the June 25th meeting.

Thank you for listening to and representing the position of the residents of Louisville.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Singer Rupp
466 Muirfield Circle
Louisville, 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: No on over-growth at Storage Tek site

From: Barbara Taylor [<mailto:bataylor1219@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 8:22 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: No on over-growth at Storage Tek site

Dear Planning Commission Members,

It has been heartening as a community during this terrible pandemic to see community members come together to support downtown businesses. Still, the owners of my favorite haunts have shared that they are barely hanging on.

That charming downtown and the small-town feel is what makes Louisville Louisville.

Don't threaten that with unnecessary and, frankly, unconscionable, approval of an extreme growth plan at the old Storage Tek site. Please note that I am not saying no growth because that is not the issue here.

The issue is MASSIVE growth out of town that would 1) draw business away from businesses (and schools and fire and city services) that have already invested in our community and 2) would plant people in places that, by virtue of geography, would require them to get in their cars several times a day.

Neither would be good for our community that has worked hard together to preserve the community and environment we live in.

Thank you,
Barbara Taylor
253 Hoover Court
Louisville, CO

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Red Tail Ridge development

-----Original Message-----

From: Brian Topping [mailto:brian.topping@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 5:18 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Red Tail Ridge development

Dear Commissioners,

I'm writing again to renew my opposition to how the Red Tail Ridge development has evolved and urge you to vote against it in its current form.

Many people have many different reasons for their positions on this, mine is that with the retail aspect of it decimated, there's really no reason to go there and spend money. With no reason to spend money there, we have no sales tax revenues from the property.

Louisville simply cannot afford it's current trajectory as a bedroom community with insufficient retail services. We need to be pulling in people from cities miles around. There's no reason the plan can't look more like Belmar in Lakewood with an office park intermixed.

I was once a supporter of this project. I believe it's important to give Medtronic an option instead of having a distributed campus where their staff have to drive long distances to meet for cross-functional problem solving. They are the perfect anchor tenant to a project like this and I also believe in the move away from retirement living to regular apartments. I simply cannot and will not support a project on that property that is not a place that I would consider taking my laptop and working on a sunny afternoon and as an alternative to Flatirons mall. I find that whole complex pretty run down and creepy given the new reality of being indoors with others.

Thank you for your consideration,

Brian Topping
White Violet Way
Louisville CO 80027
415 577-6444

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

From: Van Pollock [<mailto:LAPollock@msn.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 10:05 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge

Good morning,

I would encourage the planning commission to re-look at the development of the ConocoPhillips property, and what the impact will have on Louisville, and future generations.

We have lived here since 1982, and of course have seen many times the developers come in and be allowed to buy the City, with the promise of benefits to the taxpayers living here. Most don't live up to what is lost, by continuing to allow building out every piece of land.

We at one time were capped at a reasonable number for the land that encompasses our City.

What has happened is the development now has increased the growth to a nightmare scenario. Our roads, our schools, the amount of people that have moved here. Our quality of life has been turned upside down.

We need to work on keeping our footprints of building out huge developments out of Louisville. We will loose in the end!!!

You have the opportunity to listen to your citizens. Have some common sense.

Do not approve this development.

We have way to much to loose.

Thank you,

Leigh Ann Pollock

475 Eisenhower Drive

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Storage Tek Site Development

From: Verstraete, Jim [<mailto:jverstra@ball.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 7:02 AM

To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Storage Tek Site Development

Please please please do NOT allow the development of the Storage Tek Site! Louisville has already been seriously degraded by the recent building of apartments and condos, and we do not need or WANT more! This will kill our already struggling tax base and add to our overcrowded city and streets.

Please do not allow this to develop!

Thank you,
Jim Verstraete
Long-time Louisville resident

This message and any enclosures are intended only for the addressee. Please notify the sender by email if you are not the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not use, copy, disclose, or distribute this message or its contents or enclosures to any other person and any such actions may be unlawful. Ball reserves the right to monitor and review all messages and enclosures sent to or from this email address.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Objection to proposed, massive development at former StorageTek/Phillips 66 property

From: Eric Witte [<mailto:ericwitte@alumni.nd.edu>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 10:25 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>; Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Objection to proposed, massive development at former StorageTek/Phillips 66 property

To the Louisville Planning Commission,

As residents of the city of Louisville, we respectfully and vigorously disagree with the current proposal for development of the former StorageTek/Phillips 66 property in Louisville. The proposed development plan is for an overly massive site that would significantly change the popular, family-town atmosphere of Louisville, bring a huge increase in local traffic and pollution, lead to unprecedented population growth in Louisville, increase enrollment at the Monarch school system beyond planned capacity, and create not nearly enough open space and community separation from Broomfield.

We ask that the Planning Commission please vote NO on (i.e., reject) this development plan and PUD on the agenda for the June 25th meeting.

Thank you for listening to and representing the position of the residents of Louisville.

Regards,

Eric and Paulette Witte

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

-----Original Message-----

From: Amy Youngstrom [mailto:amy.youngstrom@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 10:52 PM

To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge

Hi~

I am a resident in the Centennial Valley neighborhood. With the current conversations around racial injustice, I'm wondering what the city is considering as far as affordable housing in the proposed Redtail Ridge development. I would love to hear more about that conversation.

Thank you,

Amy

Sent from my iPhone